



City of Annapolis
Department of Planning & Zoning
145 Gorman Street, 3rd Fl
Annapolis, MD 21401-2535

PlanZone@annapolis.gov • 410-263-7961 • Fax 410-263-1129 • TDD use MD Relay or 711 • www.annapolis.gov

Historic Preservation Commission
March 8, 2011

A. CALL TO ORDER

The public hearing of the Historic Preservation Commission was called to order in City Council Chambers by Chair Kennedy at 7:30pm on Tuesday, March 8, 2011.

B. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Sharon A. Kennedy, **Chair**
David Gallitano
Kim Finch
Tim Leahy
Shelley Rentsch
Patricia Zeno

Commissioners Absent: Thomas Bunting, **Vice Chair**

Staff Present: Lisa Craig, Historic Preservation Commission

Consultants Absent: Jeff Halpern, Architectural Consultant
Tom Bodor, Archaeology Consultant

Chair Kennedy introduced the commissioners and staff. She stated the Commission's purpose pursuant to the Authority of Article 66B, Section 8.01-8.17 of the Annotated Code of Maryland and administered the oath en masse to all persons intending to testify at the hearing.

Chair Kennedy welcomed the students of Washington College who are working on their historic preservation courses.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Leahy moved to approve the January 27, 2011 meeting minutes as amended. Ms. Zeno seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 6-0.

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Craig announced that the Department is moving forward on the MHT energy audit grant in the amount of \$6,000 and have drafted an RFP from energy performance contractors that is currently being reviewed by the Purchasing staff. A request will be distributed simultaneously soliciting historic property owners to participate in this energy efficiency program. She asked for volunteers to assist in reviewing the RFP documents once they are received.

Ms. Craig announced that the Historic Preservation staff met with DNEP staff to coordinate on the current permitting processes. Currently, there is effective communication between DNEP and HPC on projects, however, the biggest challenge occurs after the review process in that the plans need to be submitted to HPC staff for review. DNEP agreed to notify HPC staff when final plans are submitted for an historic district project. Chair Kennedy announced that the Commission will be working to modify its administrative delegation authority to allow staff to approve minor changes without having to bring them back to the Commission. She also suggested putting an article in the Ward One newsletter regarding the energy audit. Ms. Craig responded that it will be in the newspaper and announced on listserv as well as in the associations' newsletters.

E. VIOLATIONS

Ms. Craig reviewed the list of violations for after the fact approvals and there were a total of 23. She noted that seven were approved as submitted; one was brought into compliance prior to the meeting; and 13 need to be inspected for compliance. Staff is in the process of working with DNEP to complete the inspections. She provided the status of 94 and 99 East Street, 30 Fleet Street, 1 Church Circle and 25 Cathedral Street as outlined in staff memorandum dated March 8, 2011 titled "Public Hearing Staff Announcements and Violations."

F. CONSENT DOCKET

The following exhibits were presented at the hearing.

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Types
A	The formerly submitted applications for 78 Charles Street and 15 School Street
B	Written Comments of Staff, Consultants and Other Reviewing Agencies

1. **78 Charles Street** – Mary J. Robinson – Install new fence and gate.
Approved stipulated that the applicant provide verification of the notification letter to 82 Conduit Street to staff; also the gate must be part of the construction program; and provide "after" photographs within 60 days of completion of the project.
3. **15 School Street** – Ken Padgett – Install new sign.
Approved stipulated that the applicant provide "after" photographs within 60-days of completion of the project.

Ms. Zeno moved to approve the applications for 78 Charles Street and 15 School Street on the consent docket subject to the conditions. Mr. Leahy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 6-0.

G. NEW BUSINESS

2. **5 Shipwright Street** – Alt Breeding Schwarz Architects – Replace front door, extend brick wall on side of property, install iron fence, construct new dormer, construct wall to side of carport, install retractable awning above porch and landscaping.

The following exhibits were presented at the hearing.

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Types
A	The submitted application for 5 Shipwright Street
B	Revised written Comments of Staff, Consultants and Other Reviewing Agencies
C	Submitted by the applicant – Revised A201 Plan – Existing and Proposed Elevations for 5 Shipwright Street

Chair Kennedy noted that Ms. Zeno was the only commissioner who visited the site and this was acceptable with the applicant.

Ms. Schwarz had nothing more to add to that previously submitted.

Staff: Ms. Craig restated her written comments and recommended conditional approval of the application subject to the applicant consulting with DNEP staff to determine the appropriate native species plantings and provide “after” photographs within 60-days of completion of the project. Mr. Halpern’s comments and recommendations were entered into the record as part of Exhibit B.

Public: There were no public comments.

Commission: There was significant discussion between the Commission and the applicant regarding the dormer. The applicant was asked to provide a more detailed drawing to staff for review.

Ms. Rentsch noted that whereas the application for 5 Shipwright Street substantially complies with HPC guidelines A.3, C.1, C.9, D.10, D.11, D.14, D.15, D.18, D.19, D.26, D.28b, and E.1, moved approval subject to the conditions that the planting schedule is submitted; a detailed section of the roofline is provided to staff; and “after” photographs are submitted within 60-days of completion of the project. Ms. Zeno seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 6-0.

H. PRE APPLICATION

Chair Kennedy reminded those present that this is an informal discussion and is held as a courtesy to the applicants to determine feasibility and to address any other issues of concern that may arise at the hearing. This review does not constitute an approval. She explained that nothing discussed in this session will be binding on the commissioners or applicants.

1. 180 Green Street – Annapolis Elementary School/Board of Education – Renovations.

Mr. Stewart reminded the Commission that the project has gone through feasibility, schematic design, design development and is in the process of completing the design development documents to send to the Maryland State Department of Education by the end of April. The Board of Education presented to the City Dock Advisory Committee on February 28, 2011. There were some revisions made to the site plan in response to comments made at this meeting.

Mr. Ron Ilkovitch noted that the façade has been enhanced since the last discussion. He went on to discuss the development of the site; the elevation at grade around the perimeter of the building and how it affects the front ramp; and also development of the mechanical system and how it affects views from the ground as well as the surrounding areas. There is a need for a ramp in order to make the back of the building ADA accessible and the front of the building is not ADA accessible so this needs to be addressed as well. The ingress/egress on the site was discussed. A possible solution was discussed to combine the two in order to achieve a full parent drop off stacking loop to make it safe for the student. There will be creation of ADA sidewalk in the front of the building to accommodate wheelchairs. A 6-foot chiller is being proposed and will be enclosed behind a brick wall. There were suggestions that the applicant consider low maintenance plantings.

Chair Kennedy **summarized** that there were issues regarding archaeology due to the change of grade by the summer garden wall; understanding and illustrating the impacts on the public view sheds on the back side near the Compromise Street area; consider some landscape elements to soften the impact; the suggestion to move the new circle in front of the Brown building to create a more continuous and smoother ribbon of sidewalk was met with positive reaction; better introduce the green elements into the parking elements of the site plan; discussion of the width of the Compromise Street sidewalk and safety issues relating to it; revisions on the new link lower level door to mitigate the anomaly of a single opening; discussion of further detailing on the coping on the retaining wall; discussion of the roof top

units; questions on the types of screening materials proposed, caution of the use of in-kind replacements and accurate information on it; request for view points and perspectives from the water in addition to the streetscape perspectives provided; continue discussions further down the pipeline of stormwater management and mitigation across the site. Overall, the Commission continues to believe that this will be a **feasible** project.

With there being no further business, Ms. Zeno moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:23pm. Ms. Finch seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 6-0.

Tami Hook, Recorder